

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
June 1, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza**

**ABSENT: Connor, Cone, Grube**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

-SAPreservation Month 2016 - Recap

-Rehabber Club June Meeting - 1901 S Alamo - Thursday, June 23 - 5:30 PM

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                                |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-183  | 1130 Broadway    |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-184  | 1606 E Pyron Ave |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2016-177  | 327 North Dr     |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-195  | 114 North Dr     |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-071  | 901 E Houston St |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-185  | 618 E Locust     |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-190  | 226 Madison St   |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-193  | 407 Devine       |
| • Item # 11, Case No. 2016-126 | 1502 W Lynwood   |
| • Item # 12, Case No. 2016-182 | Main & Soledad   |

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

**AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**9. HDRC NO. 2016-194**

Applicant: Cappy Lawton

Address: 107 W CRAIG PLACE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a faux bois water fountain and 96" x 96" stone rest area on the North West corner of N Main and W Craig Place.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is proposing to install a faux bois style fountain at the corner of N Main and W Craig. The fountain, hardscape, and landscaping have already been installed. A stop work order was issued and the application was

June 1, 2016

submitted with the required application fee.

b. The fountain hardscaped area is 96" x 96" with brick and stone pavers, bordered by a 20" tall limestone dry stack wall and mulch and landscaping. No trees or hardscape were removed to install this site element. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, new additions should not destroy historic materials or features. Staff finds this proposal consistent with these standards.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through b.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:**

Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition of this request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**10. HDRC NO. 2016-186**

Applicant: Harrison & Billie Jo Gutierrez

Address: 426 ADAMS ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a concrete driveway at 426 Adams.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 426 Adams as well as its site design was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 3, 2015. At the time of final approval, the applicant received approval to install a decomposed granite driveway. An administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on March 22, 2016, for the installation of a concrete driveway to be twelve (12) feet in width.

b. Since the time of the issuance of the administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, a concrete driveway has been installed that is not consistent with the approved design. The Historic Building Enforcement Officer visited the site on May 9, 2016, and documented the completed concrete driveway which features an angled approach to the curb cut. The applicant has noted that an existing utility pole prevented the installation of a straight driveway.

c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, 5.B.i., the materials, width and design of driveways should be similar to those found throughout the neighborhood or those previously on the site. Staff finds that generally, the applicant's proposed materials and width are appropriate.

d. Historic driveways throughout the King William Historic District feature materials consisting of concrete, crushed gravel, decomposed granite and brick pavers all of which contain various textures and colors. Staff finds the applicant's use of dye to reduce the overall brightness of the concrete appropriate.

e. In regards to the design of the proposed driveway, staff recommends the applicant modify the angled driveway to feature slight curves. Curved driveways are found throughout the King William Historic District in historic contexts. Staff recommends the applicant provide a new site plan noting the curved driveway as recommended by staff.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the applicant the applicant pour a curved driveway as noted in finding e. Staff recommends the applicant provide a new site plan noting the curved driveway as recommended by staff.

June 1, 2016

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to move for denial of the applicants request & refer this case to the DRC.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2016-179**

**Applicant:** Adan Ochoa/ AO Design

**Address:** 130 WICKES

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace the existing vinyl siding with wood siding.
2. Replace the existing vinyl windows with wood windows.
3. Replace the existing composition shingle roof with a new shingle roof.
4. Reconstruct the rear deck.
5. Construct an addition at the rear of the primary historic structure.
6. Install a concrete driveway.
7. Install a new front door.

**FINDINGS:**

a. On March 28, 2016, an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to construct a rear addition, install two fixed windows at the rear of the primary historic structure and to construct a new deck at the rear of the primary historic structure to replace an existing deck. Other administrative items such as foundation repair, roof replacement, wood siding repair and fencing have been approved by staff.

b. A stop work order was issued on April 11, 2016, for the construction of an addition that exceeded the square footage of the addition approved by staff. All application fees have been paid.

c. **EXTERIOR MAINTENANCE** – The applicant has proposed a number of exterior maintenance and repair items such as the replacement of non-original siding and windows with appropriate wood siding and materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

d. **FRONT DOOR** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing front door and install a new front door with Craftsman elements. Staff finds the replacement of the existing front door appropriate, however the applicant's proposed door is not appropriate for a Folk Victorian house. Staff recommends the applicant propose a new front door to be approved administratively by staff.

e. **ROOF** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing shingle roof with a new shingle roof. Staff finds that an architecturally appropriate roof would include a shingle roof or a standing seam metal roof. The applicant's proposal is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

f. **ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition that is to feature approximately 200 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a low sloped shed roof and a wall plane that is consistent with that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed roof form is consistent and provides a distinguishable element to differentiate it from the primary historic structure.

g. **SCALE, MASSING & FORM** – Regarding scale, massing and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature matching foundation heights and comparable floor to ceiling heights as the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.

h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted that materials for the proposed addition will include a shingle roof, wood siding and wood windows, all to match those of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.

June 1, 2016

i. PORCH – At the rear of the primary historic structure adjacent to the proposed addition, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct a rear deck. The rear deck is simple in massing and the materials are complementary of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this request appropriate.

j. DRIVEWAY – To the west of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to install a new concrete driveway at the location of the existing driveway that is currently in disrepair. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., new driveways should feature materials, widths and designs that are historically found in the district. Staff recommends the applicant install a new ribbon driveway. The applicant should ensure that the proposed driveway is no wider than ten (10) feet in width.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a and c through h with the stipulation that the applicant provide a site plan noting the installation of a ribbon driveway.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #7 based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant propose to install a door that is architecturally appropriate to be approved administratively by staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2016-191**

Applicant: Andrew Carrillo

Address: 515 MISSION ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. To replace the original square front porch balusters with new round balusters.
2. To replace damaged and rotten wood siding, trim and other wood elements with new wood.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 515 Mission Street was constructed circa 1910, features porches spanning the front façade on both the first and second levels, wood siding and square wood columns.

b. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, architecturally appropriate square balusters with new, circular balusters that feature inappropriate detailing for the historic structure's architectural style. Accord to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, damaged wood elements should be replaced in kind to match the profile, dimensions, material and finish of the original materials. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The applicant has noted that various wood elements feature damage from rot and has proposed to replace rotten wood elements with in kind materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant install square balusters that match the existing.

June 1, 2016

Staff recommends approval of item #2 based on finding c.

**CASE COMMENT:**

The existing, architecturally appropriate square balusters were removed prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness and have been replaced by circular balusters which are architecturally inappropriate.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Rose Kanusky- Speaking in support of staff.

Cherise Bell- Speaking in support of staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to move for denial of item 1 & approval of item 2.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2016-172**

Applicant: Edward Pape

Address: 283 W MARIPOSA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. replace existing wooden swinging garage door with a metal overhead garage door with decorative elements
2. expand existing concrete driveway from 10' wide to 17' wide by repouring slab and maintaining 12' approach
3. widen sidewalk next to curb

**FINDINGS:**

a. The request was heard by the HDRC on May 18, 2016, at which the request was referred to the DRC. The applicant met with the committee members on May 25, 2016, at which members expressed concerns of the width of the apron and mentioned that the garage siding looked like an addition. Committee members agreed that the applicant should submit a site plan with the agreed upon driveway width of 17' and new elevation drawing of the garage façade to match architecture style of existing door.

b. The applicant is requesting to replace existing 8' x 6'-6" wooden swinging garage door with an 8' x 8' overhead metal garage door with decorative elements and trim, and to paint to match existing color. Staff finds the door appropriate in size and architecturally detailing, but finds the material inconsistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 6.B. state that doors should be replaced with in-kind materials.

c. The applicant is proposing to tear up existing 10' concrete driveway and repour a 17' wide concrete driveway and maintain the 12' apron, which is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site elements. The Guidelines state that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10' and that new driveway configurations should be similar to what's historically found in the district. Staff made a site visit on May 6, 2016, and found that driveways in Olmos Park Terrace Historic District historically are 10' wide. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. also states that pervious paving surfaces may be considered when replacement is necessary. Staff recommends that the applicant maintain the historic driveway configuration and width and consider using a pervious material such as decomposed granite.

d. The applicant is proposing to widen the sidewalk near the curb. The applicant has not yet provided staff with specific dimensions. Guidelines for the Site Elements 5.A.iii. state that historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways should be followed. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

e. A Certificate of Appropriateness was already issued to repair and replace stone on the left façade and to replace existing front walkway in-kind.

June 1, 2016

f. 283 W Mariposa is located in Olmos Park Terrace Phase II, which was designated January 27, 2008.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial of item #1, #2 and #3 based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the door be replaced with in-kind materials, the applicant maintain the linear dimension and width of the driveway, and consider widening with permeable material.

**CASE COMMENT:**

A door hangar was issued for doing stone work prior to receiving approval. The application for the stone work was submitted and an administratively Certificate of Appropriateness was issued. A stop work order was issued for driveway done prior to approval. The HDRC application was submitted and post-work application fee was paid. Transportation and Capital Improvements performed street repair and apron replacement.

HDRC: 5/18/16

DRC: 5/25/16

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Brittain for approval of the garage door with the stipulations that the applicant return to staff with a character & in-kind materials as discussed, a jam detail to ensure there is a profile & that the proposed concrete driveway be no more than 10ft wide while not exceeding 15ft wide with permeable material, & that the sidewalk flare butting the street be out of reversible materials.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2016-189**

**Applicant:** Darryl Ohlenbusch

**Address:** 129 BARRERA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a stone clad masonry wall along the property line at 129 Barrera

**FINDINGS:**

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. The applicant has proposed to construct a stone clad masonry wall along the perimeter of the property at 129 Barrera. According to the Guidelines, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. Additionally, the design and materials of the fence should appear similar to the house or main structure. The applicant has proposed for the wall to feature stone, however, at this time a specific stone has not been specified. Staff finds that a stone that is complementary of the stone of the primary historic structure on the property should be used.

c. New walls should be constructed in locations where they historically would have existed. Throughout the Lavaca Historic District and Barrera Street, numerous front and side yard fences can be found. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to locate the wall in the front and side yard along the property line appropriate and consistent with the historic examples found in the district.

d. In regards to height, walls within the front yard of a property should not exceed four (4) feet in height. The applicant has proposed a front yard height of four (4) feet and a side and rear yard height of six (6) feet. The applicant has noted that the proposed wall will transition from four (4) to six (6) feet to the south of the side window which fronts Matagorda. Given the distinct architectural feature on an addition on the east façade of the structure, staff finds that an appropriate transition from four (4) to six (6) feet in height would occur here. This location is similar to the footprint of the existing side yard fence.

June 1, 2016

e. While the proposed fence will feature a material, stone, that is consistent with that of the primary historic structure, staff that additional transparency would be appropriate at the public right.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That a stone that is complementary of the primary historic structure's façade be used.
- ii. That the applicant modify the proposed height of the side yard fence to not exceed more than four (4) feet in height until it reaches the point of the rear addition.
- iii. That the applicant explore ways to increase the fence's transparency in front of the primary historic structure.

**CASE COMMENT:**

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Salmon for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2016-187**

Applicant: Custom Sign Creations

Address: 408 E HOUSTON ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage for the new construction at 408 E Houston Street. The applicant is requesting the following signage:

1. Install two (2) wall signs at the street level on E Houston and College that are to be 19' – 0" in length and 3' – 8" in height, each totaling approximately seventy (70) square feet in size. These signs will be face lit channel letters, are to read "Hilton Garden Inn" and will feature illumination by red and white LED's. Each cabinet will be constructed with aluminum and feature an acrylic face. These signs are noted as A1 and A2.
2. Install two (2) blade signs on E Houston and College that are to be 25' – 0" in height and 6' – 0" in width, each totaling 300 square feet in size. These signs will be aluminum cabinets with routed out openings, be internally lit by fluorescent lamps and will read "Hilton Garden Inn". Each cabinet's letters will feature an acrylic face. These signs are noted as B1 and B2.
3. Install one (1) wall sign on the east elevation facing Losoya that is to be 24' – 1 ½" in length and 4' – 8" in height totaling approximately 115 square feet. This sign will be face lit channel letters, is to read "Hilton Garden Inn" and will feature illumination by red and white LED's. This cabinet will be constructed with aluminum and feature an acrylic face. This sign is noted as C.

**FINDINGS:**

a. According to the Guidelines for Signage, 1.A.i., each building will be allowed one major and two minor and that total square footage should not exceed fifty (50) square feet. The new construction at 408 E Houston street features street facing facades on both E Houston and College Streets. In total, the applicant has proposed approximately 220 square feet for both the E Houston and College Street facades. While the proposed square footage is more than the recommended amount by the Guidelines for Signage, staff finds that there are examples

June 1, 2016

of facades featuring more than fifty (50) square feet of signage.

b. New signs should be designed to be in proportion to the building's façade, respecting the buildings, size, scale, mass, height and rhythms as well as the sizes of window and door openings. The applicant has proposed to locate both wall signs (A1 and A2) above entrances; a pedestrian entrance on E Houston and a vehicular entrance. Both of these proposed signs are the same square footage, but are located above entrances with varying hierarchies. Additionally, College Street features many facades that are void of signage and when signage is present, it is significantly smaller than signage addressing E Houston. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the overall size of the College Street wall sign (A2) to be no larger than fifty (50) square feet.

c. The applicant has proposed two (2) blade signs to be located above and to the right of both proposed wall signs. Each blade sign is to total approximately 300 square feet in size, including both sides. Staff finds the applicant's proposed locations appropriate, however, similar to the previously mentioned College Street wall sign, the proposed College Street blade sign should be reduced in size to not exceed fifty (50) square feet each.

d. In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed for both wall signs to be face lit aluminum channel letters, are to read "Hilton Garden Inn" and will feature illumination by red and white LED's. Each cabinet will be constructed with aluminum and feature an acrylic face diffusing the LED lights. The Guidelines for Signage 3.C.iv., specific to wall signs states that channel letters should avoid being used unless historically appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install reverse channel letter walls signs.

e. The applicant's proposed materials for both blade signs include be aluminum cabinets with routed out openings, be internally lit by fluorescent lamps and will read "Hilton Garden Inn". Each cabinet's letters will feature an acrylic face. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.

f. Facing east toward Losoya Street, the applicant has proposed a wall sign is to be 24' – 1 ½" in length and 4' – 8" in height totaling approximately 115 square feet. This sign will be face lit channel letters, is to read "Hilton Garden Inn" and will feature illumination by red and white LED's. This cabinet will be constructed with aluminum and feature an acrylic face. Staff finds that the location, size and orientation of the sign are inappropriate. There is neither a historic example nor precedent for signage at this location.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of sign B1 as submitted based on finding c.

Staff recommends approval of sign B2 with the stipulation that the overall size be reduced to no more than fifty (50) square feet; this includes both sides, as noted in finding c.

Staff recommends approval of sign A1 with the stipulation that reverse channel letters be used as noted in finding e.

Staff recommends approval of sign A2 with the stipulations that reverse channel letters be used and that the overall size be reduced to no more than fifty (50) square feet as noted in findings b.

Staff does not recommend approval of sign C based on finding f.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to move for approval of the signage as proposed with the removal of sign B1, the addition of a sign on the protrusion on the house side street, the removal of sign C & the approval of sign B2 as it is now proportioned. All signs need to be reversed channel letters.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

19. HDRC NO. 2016-192

Applicant: David Ericsson

Address: 625 BURLESON ST

**REQUEST:**

June 1, 2016

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story single family structure with a detached accessory structure at 625 Burleson.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story, single family structure with a detached accessory structure at 625 Burleson at the corner of Burleson and N Pine in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This property is addressed for Burleson, however, the applicant's proposed orientation is to N Pine.

b. **SETBACKS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. If no consistent setback has been established, the median setback of all buildings should be used. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately twenty (20) feet, aligning the front porch of the proposed new construction with the adjacent structure. This setback is not consistent with the prominent setback on this block. Staff recommends the applicant propose a setback that is consistent with the majority of the houses on the block; all of which are setback approximately eighteen (18) feet from the sidewalk at the public right of way.

c. **ORIENTATION** – The front façade of new construction should be oriented in a manner that is consistent with the historic example of the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the front façade of the structure toward N Pine. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.ii.

d. **FRONT PORCH** -Many historic structures feature a front porch that is recessed within the plan producing a front façade that features depth. The applicant has proposed a front porch with little depth that features only a porch overhang and a stoop. This is not an appropriate front porch design within a historic district. The deepening of the front porch could potentially lead to a consistent setback.

e. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The block predominantly features single story historic structures, however, there are examples of structures featuring either two stories or roof designs that present height not typical of a one story structure. Staff finds the applicant's proposed height of two stories at approximately thirty (30) feet appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

f. **TRANSITIONS** – Step downs in building height should be utilized to transition from the height of the proposed new construction to the single story height of the neighboring structure. The applicant has proposed a smaller massing between the highest massing of the house and the neighboring structures. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a modified roof plane to facilitate this transition. This is Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii.

g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front gable similar to the historic structures on the site. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a shed roof on the north elevation. Staff finds both of these proposed roof forms appropriate.

i. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that complementary of the openings found on historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i.

j. **LOT COVERAGE** – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

k. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed board and batten siding, composite siding, aluminum windows, cedar rafters, a standing seam metal roof, stucco skirting, cedar fencing, galvalume corrugated metal siding and an exposed metal flue. Generally, the applicant's materials are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., however, staff recommends the applicant provide a sample of the proposed galvalume siding to staff as this material is not typical for historic districts. Staff finds this material may be appropriate if properly dimensioned to relate to traditional wood siding.

l. **WINDOWS** – As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed aluminum windows. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed section noting the framing of the proposed windows as well as information on the proposed windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within the walls. The applicant should adhere to the Office of Historic Preservation's window policy document in regards to the proposed aluminum

June 1, 2016

windows.

m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds that in general the applicant's proposed design is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.

n. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed a horizontal element to separate the wall planes between the first and second floor. The trim piece as currently proposed is located at the bottom of the second floor windows. Staff finds the placement of this trim piece inappropriate. Additionally, staff finds the applicant's proposed front porch covering's height inappropriately placed in relationship to the second level windows. The applicant should modify these elements prior to returning to the HDRC.

o. **GARAGE** – At the rear (west) of the primary structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a single story accessory structure. In regards to massing and form, building size and character, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. The applicant has proposed a garage door to facilitate vehicular access to and from Burleson.

p. **GARAGE** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v., garage doors that are similar in proportions and materials as those found historically in the district should be used. At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with information regarding the garage doors.

q. **GARAGE** – The Dignowity Hill Historic District features properties with accessory structures in various locations at the rear of the primary historic structure. Many structures are located along both the side and rear property lines. In regards to the proposed accessory structure's orientation and setbacks, the applicant has proposed to locate the proposed accessory structure parallel with the side (north) and rear (west) property lines to include a five (5) foot setback. Staff finds the location appropriate.

r. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment will be located to the north of the proposed structure to be screened by a cedar privacy fence. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.

s. **FENCES** – Around the perimeter of the property, the applicant has proposed to install a cedar privacy fence on the south, west and north sides of the property. The applicant has noted that the fence is to be 6' – 0" tall and 6' – 2" tall. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the height of the proposed fence to be consistent with the UDC.

t. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided a site plan noting a proposed sidewalk and driveway as well as some landscaping elements, however, a detailed site plan noting the widths of the proposed sidewalk and driveway is required by staff. The applicant should propose a driveway that does not exceed ten (10) feet in width.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the applicant's proposed massing, architectural details and materials. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval. Staff recommends the following prior returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant provide staff an updated site plan noting setbacks that are consistent with the predominant historic example on N Pine as noted in finding b.
2. That the applicant provide staff an updated front porch design that includes additional depth and massing as noted in finding d as well as address the arrangement of the porch in relationship to the second level windows.
3. That the applicant provide staff with a sample of the proposed metal siding.
4. That the applicant provide specifications and a wall section noting the proposed framing for the proposed windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within the walls.
5. That the applicant provide specifications for the proposed garage door.
6. That the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan noting the width of the proposed sidewalk, driveway and all landscaping materials.
7. That the applicant provide additional information for the proposed fence including an appropriate height.

#### **CASE COMMENT:**

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any

June 1, 2016

portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for conceptual approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20 HDRC NO. 2016-196**

**Applicant:** Ignacio Rodriguez/McChesney/Bianco Architecture

**Address:** 7615 Kennedy Circle

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Install Healing Garden to include decomposed granite circular pathway, new trees and shrubs, lawn, trellis and plaza
2. Install dining courtyard to include bar seating, new deck, new decomposed granite seating area, two shade trellises, and metal tables and chairs
3. Install raised pedestrian crossing made of red brick pavers at the south point of Kennedy Circle
4. Install informal gathering areas south of Kennedy Circle and to the west and east of Building 150
5. Install new 12' sidewalks made of red brick pavers, parallel to existing sidewalks south of Kennedy Circle
6. Add asphalt parking spaces northeast of Building 180
7. Add windows to building 180 on west, north and south facades

**FINDINGS:**

a. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** - Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. **REQUEST #1 – SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant is proposing to install a healing garden to include entry trellis, a plaza, lawn area, decomposed granite circular path, and other shrubs and trees. Currently the site has grass with 3 trees. No trees have been proposed to be removed. Planting details have not been submitted with this request for conceptual approval. Staff recommends that drought tolerant plans found in Appendix A should be planted.

c. **REQUEST #2 - SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant is proposing to install a dining courtyard to include metal tables and chairs, bar stools on upper terrace, decomposed granite area, wooden deck under existing trees, metal shade trellises on south edge and planting area around edge of dining. The courtyard will be located on secondary façade of Building 180. According to the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District Design Guidelines and Master Plan, secondary facades are not the most important facades but have a public entrance. Staff finds that the permeable hardscape, deck, and shade trellises minimal and consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The applicant submitted two options for the Plaza Promenade. This design incorporates requests #3, #4, and #5. Option 2 is not consistent with the design guidelines and is not recommended. Option 1 is more consistent with some modifications.

d.1 **REQUEST #3 – SIDEWALKS** – The proposed raised pedestrian crossing in option 1, made of pavers at the south point of Kennedy Circle is not consistent with the Public Realm Guidelines, which state that brick paving or stamped concrete in vehicular streets is not appropriate.

d.2 **REQUEST #4 - LANDSCAPE** – The proposed informal gathering areas in option 1, south of Kennedy Circle and to the west and east of Building 150 are consistent with the Guidelines 3.B., which state that trees should be planted between the sidewalk and the building. No trees have been proposed to be removed. Planting details have not been submitted with this request for conceptual approval. Staff recommends that drought tolerant plans found in Appendix A should be planted.

d.3 **REQUEST #5 – SIDEWALKS** – The proposed 12' sidewalks in option 1 are made of red brick pavers, are parallel to existing sidewalks south of Kennedy Circle; staff finds these appropriate in location, but not in material according to the Guidelines. Guidelines 5.A.4. state that sidewalks should be linear and made with grey concrete.

June 1, 2016

e. REQUEST #6 – PARKING – The proposed parking plan necessitates the details of proposed street re-alignment and road configuration in the district that is not a part of this request. Staff has not been provided details of the re-alignment or replacement plans for the northeast curve. The new proposed parking would require the removal of small trees north of Building 180 and the removal of one dead tree south of the existing courtyard.

f. REQUEST #7 – WINDOWS - The applicant is proposing to create new window openings on the West, North and South facades of building 180. According to Design Guidelines and Master Plan for the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District, new windows should be differentiated from the originals. However, the Guidelines identify that the west façade is the primary façade and should not be altered. Staff finds the fenestration modification on the West façade inappropriate. Staff finds the window openings proposed on the North and South facades appropriate as they are not indicated as primary or secondary facades.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 through #5 and #7 with the following stipulations:

1. That drought tolerant plants be detailed when the applicant returns for final approval from the HDRC.
2. That the sidewalk and crosswalk elements not use red brick pavers but grey concrete.
3. That the applicant does not alter the West façade of Building 180.

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of item #6 at this time and recommends that the applicant return with more details of sidewalk, road connection and parking.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval of items #1 through #7 and Plaza Promenade option 2 with the following stipulations:

1. That drought tolerant plants be detailed in the landscape plan when the applicant returns for final approval from the HDRC.
2. That the sidewalk and crosswalk elements be consistent with the Guidelines for the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District and that red brick is appropriate for detailing.
3. That the applicant explore alternatives to the two flanking turnarounds.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 18, 2016**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve May 18, 2016 minutes.

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Feldman, Salmon, Brittain, Garza

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:16 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair